CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator:		Team:	CCRB Case #:	☐ Force	☐ Discourt.	☐ U.S.
Emma Stydahar		Squad #13	202004642	✓ Abuse	O.L.	☐ Injury
Incident Date(s)		Location of Incident:	•	Precinct:	18 Mo. SOL	EO SOL
Wednesday, 06/03/2020 6:43 PM	1	Tillary Street and Gold	Street	84	12/3/2021	5/4/2022
Date/Time CV Reported		CV Reported At:	How CV Reported:	Date/Time	Received at CCI	RB
Fri, 06/05/2020 4:08 PM		CCRB	Call Processing System	Fri, 06/05/	2020 4:08 PM	
Complainant/Victim	Туре	Home Addre	ess			
Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command			
1. POM Toby Lau	11112	964607	084 PCT			
Officer(s)	Allegati	on		Inve	estigator Recon	nmendation
A.POM Toby Lau		Abuse: Police Officer Toby Lau refused to provide his name to \$87(2)(b)				
B.POM Toby Lau	Abuse: Police Officer Toby Lau refused to provide his shield number to \$87(2)(b)					

Case Summary

On June 5, 2020, § 87(2)(b) • filed this complaint via the CCRB's call processing system.

On June 3, 2020 at 6:43pm, \$37(2)(b) was headed to a protest at the Barclays Center when, at Gold Street and Tillary Street in Brooklyn, he approached Police Officer Toby Lau of the 84th Precinct, who was working as stationhouse security and standing behind a barricade near that stationhouse. PO Lau's nameplate was missing from his uniform and his shield number was covered by a black "mourning band." § 87(2)(b) began filming PO Lau and requested PO Lau's name and shield number multiple times, but PO Lau refused to provide that information (Allegations A and B: Abuse of Authority, \$87(2)(9)). No arrest or summons resulted from this incident.

The Body Worn Camera ("BWC") footage request for this incident was returned negative. PO Lau was not equipped with a BWC at the time of the incident. § 87(2)(b) recorded this incident on his cell phone and he provided the video to the investigation. The footage is attached to IA # 25 and is summarized in IA # 26 (Board Review 01 and 02).

Findings and Recommendations Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Toby Lau refused to provide his name to Allegation (B) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Toby Lau refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b) and PO Lau both testified that §87(2)(b) walked up to PO Lau and began recording him. Their CCRB statements were consistent with the cell phone video of the incident (Board Review 03; Board Review 04). The one minute and three seconds video depicts [887(2)(5)] asking where PO Lau's nameplate is twice. PO Lau responds, "Like I said, we also have interim orders." \$37(2)(b) again asks PO Lau where his nameplate is and points out that PO Lau's shield number is not visible. PO Lau says "Like I said, we also have interim orders. When we're given orders from directly above, it's different." § 87(2)(b) says "What's your name, officer? What's your name and badge number? You gotta identify yourself at least, I'm just curious. I want to let the people know – I'm streaming right now, let the people know. Help me out. What's your name and badge number?" PO Lau has \$87(2)(b) confirm that he is live streaming the interaction. again asks, "What's your badge number?" PO Lau responds, "Yeah, right now I'm not

giving that away, man. It's different times right now" (Board Review 01). 887(2)(5) and PO Lau

both testified that the interaction lasted a few minutes and concluded with §87(2)(b)

away without being provided with PO Lau's name or shield number.

PO Lau testified that he did not realize his mourning band was covering his shield number during this incident. He said mourning bands are supposed to be worn on one's shield, but above the shield number. The interim order PO Lau referenced instructed members of service to wear mourning bands on their shields to memorialize members of service who had died from COVID-19. It did not instruct officers to use mourning bands to cover their shield numbers. PO Lau was not wearing his nameplate on his uniform because he had seen other officers without their nameplates affixed to their uniforms, which led him to conclude that that was what they were supposed to do. PO Lau did not provide his name and shield number to §87(2)(b) upon request because he did not think it was safe to provide his identifying information while \$87(2)(6) was live streaming the encounter to unknown viewers online. PO Lau did not feel unsafe or threatened by \$87(2)(b) specifically (Board Review 04).

Officers must courteously and clearly state their rank, name, shield number, and command, or otherwise provide that information, to anyone who requests they do so. NYPD Patrol Guide,

walking

§ 87(2)(g)		
	n and Officer CCRB Histories	
• § 87(2)(b)		
_		
•		
•		
Police Officer Lau has been a complaint in which he has been	member of service for two years en a subject.	and this is the first CCRB
 This case was not suitable for 	tion, Civil and Criminal Histori	<u>ies</u>
	has not filed a Notice of	of Claim with the NYC
	g this incident (Board Review 0)	
<u> </u>	urt Administration (OCA), § 87(2)(b	has no history of
criminal convictions (Board I	Review 08).	
Squad No.: <u>13</u>		
Investigator: <u>Inv. Emma Stydahar</u>	Inv. Emma Stydahar	10/01/2020
Signature	Print Title & Name	Date
Squad Leader: IM Laura Kastner	IM Laura Kastner	_10/01/2020
Signature	Print Title & Name	Date